

not limited to ethnicity, race, gender, religion, geographic location, socio-economic status, and physical challenges. Applicants are strongly encouraged to adhere to the advancement of this principle both in program administration and in program content. Please refer to the review criteria under the "Support for Diversity" section for specific suggestions on incorporating diversity into the total proposal. Public Law 104-319 provides that "in carrying out programs of educational and cultural exchange in countries whose people do not fully enjoy freedom and democracy," the Bureau "shall take appropriate steps to provide opportunities for participation in such programs to human rights and democracy leaders of such countries." Public Law 106-113 requires that the governments of the countries described above do not have inappropriate influence in the selection process. Proposals should reflect advancement of this goal in their program contents, to the full extent deemed feasible.

Review Process: The Bureau will acknowledge receipt of all proposals and will review them for technical eligibility. Proposals will be deemed ineligible if they do not fully adhere to the guidelines stated herein and in the Solicitation Package. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the program office. Eligible proposals will then be forwarded to panels of senior Bureau officers for advisory review. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Office of the Legal Advisor or by other Bureau elements. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of the Department of State's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final technical authority for assistance awards (grants or cooperative agreements) resides with the Bureau's Grants Officer.

Review Criteria: Technically eligible applications will be competitively reviewed according to the criteria stated below. Particular weight will be given to items one and two, and all remaining criteria will be evaluated equally.

1. **Overall Quality:** Proposals should exhibit originality and substance, consonant with the highest standards of American teaching and scholarship. Program design should reflect the main currents as well as the debates within the subject discipline of each institute. Program elements should be coherently and thoughtfully integrated. Lectures, panels, field visits and readings, taken as a whole, should offer a balanced presentation of issues, reflecting both the continuity of the American

experience as well as the diversity and dynamism inherent in it.

2. **Program Planning and Administration:** Proposals should demonstrate careful planning. The organization and structure of the institute should be clearly delineated and be fully responsive to all program objectives. A program syllabus (noting specific sessions and topical readings supporting each academic unit) should be included, as should a calendar of activities. The travel component should not simply be a tour, but should be an integral and substantive part of the program, reinforcing and complementing the academic segment. Proposals should provide evidence of continuous administrative and managerial capacity as well as the means by which program activities and logistical matters will be implemented.

3. **Institutional Capacity:** Proposed personnel, including faculty and administrative staff as well as outside presenters, should be fully qualified to achieve the project's goals. Library and meeting facilities, housing, meals, transportation and other logistical arrangements should fully meet the needs of the participants.

4. **Support for Diversity:** Substantive support of the bureau's policy on diversity should be demonstrated. This can be accomplished through documentation, such as a written statement, summarizing past and/or ongoing activities and efforts that further the principle of diversity within the organization and its activities. Program activities that address this issue should be highlighted.

5. **Experience:** Proposals should demonstrate an institutional record of successful exchange program activity, indicating the experience that the organization and its professional staff have had in working with foreign educators.

6. **Evaluation and Follow-up:** A plan for evaluating activities during the Institute and at its conclusion should be included. Proposals should discuss provisions made for follow-up with returned grantees as a means of establishing longer-term individual and institutional linkages.

7. **Cost Effectiveness:** Proposals should maximize cost-sharing through direct institutional contributions, in-kind support, and other private sector support. Overhead and administrative components, including salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible.

Authority: Overall grant making authority for this program is contained in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Public Law 87-256, as amended, also

known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. The purpose of the Act is "to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries * * *; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations * * * and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world."

Notice: The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by any Bureau representative. Explanatory information provided by the Bureau that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of this RFP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Bureau reserves the right to reduce, revise, or increase proposal budgets in accordance with the needs of the program and the availability of funds. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements.

Notification: Final awards cannot be made until funds have been appropriated by Congress, and allocated and committed through internal Bureau procedures.

Dated: September 27, 2000.

Helena Kane Finn,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 00-25372 Filed 10-4-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 3429]

Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Request for Proposals: Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX) Disability Reentry Workshops

ACTION: Request for Proposals.

SUMMARY: The Office of Citizen Exchanges, Youth Programs Division, of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs announces an open competition for the FLEX Disability Reentry Workshops. Public and private non-profit organizations meeting the provisions described in IRS regulation 26 CFR 1.501(c) may submit proposals for the conduct of special year-end reentry workshops for students with disabilities participating, respectively, in the 2000/01 and 2001/02 Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX) programs. Approximately 12-15 students will participate each year (a total of 25-30).

All programs must comply with J-1 visa regulations. Please refer to the Solicitation Package for further information.

Budget Guidelines: Applicants must submit a comprehensive budget for the entire program. Awards may not exceed \$55,000. There must be a summary budget as well as breakdowns reflecting both administrative and program budgets. Applicants may provide separate sub-budgets for each program component, phase, location, or activity to provide clarification. Administrative costs should be kept as low as possible. Cost sharing is encouraged. Allowable costs for the program include the following:

- (1) Transportation for participants from their host city/town to workshop site
- (2) Daily travel at workshop site location
- (3) Room and board during the time of the workshops
- (4) Rental of facilities and equipment
- (5) Fees for related activities/excursions
- (6) Honoraria for speakers/trainers, as appropriate
- (7) Necessary reasonable accommodations

Please refer to the Solicitation Package for complete budget guidelines and formatting instructions.

Announcement Title and Number: All correspondence with the Bureau concerning this RFP should reference the above title and number ECA/PE/C-00-75.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Youth Programs Division, Office of Citizen Exchanges, ECA/PE/C/PY, Room 568, U.S. Department of State, 301 4th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20547, phone: 202/619-6299, fax: 202/619-5311, e-mail: <daronson@pd.state.gov> to request a Solicitation Package. The Solicitation Package contains detailed award criteria, required application forms, specific budget instructions, and standard guidelines for proposal preparation. Please specify Bureau Program Officer Diana Aronson on all other inquiries and correspondence.

Please read the complete **Federal Register** announcement before sending inquiries or submitting proposals. Once the RFP deadline has passed, Bureau staff may not discuss this competition with applicants until the proposal review process has been completed.

To Download a Solicitation Package
Via Internet: The entire Solicitation Package may be downloaded from the Bureau's website at <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/rfps>.

Please read all information before downloading.

Deadline for Proposals: All proposal copies must be received at the Bureau

of Educational and Cultural Affairs by 5 p.m. Washington, DC time on Monday, December 4, 2000. Faxed documents will not be accepted at any time. Documents postmarked the due date but received on a later date will not be accepted. Each applicant must ensure that the proposals are received by the above deadline.

Applicants must follow all instructions in the Solicitation Package. The original and seven copies of the application should be sent to: U.S. Department of State, SA-44, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Ref.: ECA/PE/C-01-75, Program Management, ECA/EX/PM, Room 336, 301 4th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20547.

Diversity, Freedom and Democracy Guidelines

Pursuant to the Bureau's authorizing legislation, programs must maintain a non-political character and should be balanced and representative of the diversity of American political, social, and cultural life. "Diversity" should be interpreted in the broadest sense and encompass differences including, but not limited to ethnicity, race, gender, religion, geographic location, socio-economic status, and physical challenges. Applicants are strongly encouraged to adhere to the advancement of this principle both in program administration and in program content. Please refer to the review criteria under the "Support for Diversity" section for specific suggestions on incorporating diversity into the total proposal. Public Law 104-319 provides that "in carrying out programs of educational and cultural exchange in countries whose people do not fully enjoy freedom and democracy," the Bureau "shall take appropriate steps to provide opportunities for participation in such programs to human rights and democracy leaders of such countries." Public Law 106-113 requires that the governments of the countries described above do not have inappropriate influence in the selection process. Proposals should reflect advancement of these goals in their program contents, to the full extent deemed feasible.

Review Process

The Bureau will acknowledge receipt of all proposals and will review them for technical eligibility. Proposals will be deemed ineligible if they do not fully adhere to the guidelines stated herein and in the Solicitation Package. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the program office, as well as the Public Diplomacy section overseas, where

appropriate. Eligible proposals will be forwarded to panels of Bureau officers for advisory review. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Office of the Legal Adviser or by other Department elements. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of the Department of State's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final technical authority for assistance awards (grants or cooperative agreements) resides with the Bureau's Grants Officer.

Review Criteria

Technically eligible applications will be competitively reviewed according to the criteria stated below. These criteria are not rank ordered and all carry equal weight in the proposal evaluation:

1. Quality of the program idea:

Proposals should exhibit originality, substance, precision, and relevance to the Bureau's mission.

2. Program planning: Detailed agenda and relevant work plan should demonstrate substantive undertakings and logistical capacity. Agenda and plan should adhere to the program overview and guidelines described above.

3. Ability to achieve program objectives:

Objectives should be reasonable, feasible, and flexible. Proposals should clearly demonstrate how the organization will meet the program's objectives and plan.

4. Support of Diversity: Proposals should demonstrate substantive support of the Bureau's policy on diversity. Achievable and relevant features should be cited in both program administration

5. Institutional Capacity: Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program or project's goals. Proposing organization should demonstrate it has experience with disability programming and international youth exchange, as well as familiarity with the culture of the New Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union.

6. Track Record: Proposals should demonstrate an institutional record of successful exchange programs, including responsible fiscal management and full compliance with all reporting requirements for past Bureau grants as determined by Bureau Grant Staff. The Bureau will consider the past performance of prior recipients and the demonstrated potential of new applicants.

7. Multiplier effect/impact: Proposed programs should describe how workshop participants will be motivated and enabled to reach out to other individuals with disabilities in their home countries.

8. *Follow-on Activities*: Proposals should describe how workshop participants will be provided with knowledge and tools that will prepare them to work in support of disability rights in their home countries.

9. *Project Evaluation*: Proposals should include a plan to evaluate the activity's success. A draft survey questionnaire or other technique plus description of a methodology to use to link outcomes to original project objectives is recommended. Successful applicants will be expected to submit a final report after the project has been completed.

10. *Cost-effectiveness/Cost Sharing*: The overhead and administrative components of the proposal, including salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible. All other items should be necessary and appropriate. Proposals should maximize cost-sharing through other private sector support as well as institutional direct funding contributions.

Authority

Overall grant making authority for this program is contained in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Public Law 87-256, as amended, also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. The purpose of the Act is "to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries * * *; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations * * * and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world." The funding authority for the program above is provided through legislation of the Freedom Support Act.

Notice

The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by any Bureau representative. Explanatory information provided by the Bureau that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Bureau reserves the right to reduce, revise, or increase proposal budgets in accordance with the needs of the program and the availability of funds. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements.

Notification

Final awards cannot be made until funds have been appropriated by Congress, allocated and committed through internal Bureau procedures.

Dated: September 29, 2000.

Helena Kane Finn,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 00-25650 Filed 10-4-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice #: 3413]

U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; Notice of Meeting

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, reauthorized pursuant to Public Law 106-113 (H.R. 3194, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000), will meet on Friday, October 20, 2000 in Room 600, 301 4th St., SW, Washington, D.C. from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

The Commission will discuss the release of its report on the consolidation of USIA into the State Department and the effectiveness of U.S. public diplomacy in the former Soviet Union.

Members of the general public may attend the meeting, though attendance of public members will be limited to the seating available. Access to the building is controlled, and individual building passes are required for all attendees. Persons who plan to attend should contact David J. Kramer, Executive Director, at (202) 619-4463.

September 29, 2000.

David J. Kramer,

Executive Director, U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 00-25781 Filed 10-4-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office

of Management and Budget (OMB) for extension of currently approved collection. The ICR describes the nature of their information collection and the expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on June 30, 2000, (FR 65, page 40716).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 6, 2000. A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judy Street on (202) 267-9895.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

Title: Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Standards Survey.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

OMB Control Number: 2120-0611.

Forms(s): N/A.

Affected Public: Approximately 300 representatives of the U.S. commercial launch industry and other industry representatives from related industries such as U.S. satellite manufacturers and users, as well as representatives from businesses and associations which have an interest in our business-related concerns with the U.S. commercial launch industry.

Abstract: This survey is being disseminated to collect industry input on the Customer Service standards published and disseminated by the Office of the Associate Administrator for commercial Space Transportation (AST).

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 300 hours annually.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention FAA Desk Officer.

Comments are invited on whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden on the proposed information collections; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, in including the use of automated collection techniques of other forms of information technology.